



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

JOURNAL

OF THE

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

The Position of the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa in Vedic Literature.—By MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, Professor in the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

“Wie er räuspert und wie er spuckt,
Das habt ihr ihm glücklich abgeguckt.”

THE edition of the GB. in the Bibliotheca Indica¹ is a marvel of editorial ineptitude. Dr. Otto von Böhtlingk has subjected the first prapāṭhaka to a critical review,² and has pointed out a considerable list of blunders in that part of the work.³ The text, however, grows worse as it goes on; the list of obvious mistakes is portentous. Especially do the editors betray a most thorough-going lack of knowledge of the subject-matter of grāuta-literature, as when they consistently print the words *praūga* and *evayāmarut* as three words (e. g. *pra u gañ*, p. 130, l. 4; *pra u ge*, p. 137, ll. 6, 7, 9; *eva yā marutañ*, p. 170, last line). Inasmuch as the text is to a great extent a compilation from other Brāhmaṇas, the work of the editors can to a considerable degree be controlled and amended, as, e. g., by comparing GB. i. 5. 2 with ÇB. xii. 2. 1. 1–9 (*pras'ne yo*, for *prasneyo*, *kulyudaghna*s for *kulphadaghna*s); GB. ii. 1. 11 with TS. ii. 5. 5. 3 (*chañ vaṣaṭ* for *chambaṭ*; *anuhūtā-*

¹ *The Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa of the Atharva-Veda.* Edited by Rājendra-lāla Mitra and Haracandra Vidyābhūṣaṇa. Calcutta, 1872.

² *Berichte der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, April, 1896, pp. 12 ff. of the reprint.

³ P. 8, ll. 1, 2, read *camasādhvaryavo* for *camasā*, *adhvaryavo*, not throwing out *adhvaryavo* with Böhtlingk, p. 15. The first hemistich of the mantra in GB. i. 1. 9 (p. 6, l. 9) is quoted by Sāyaṇa, Introd. to the AV., p. 5, as *greṣṭho hi vedas tapaso 'dhijāto brahmajñānām hṛdaye sambabhūva*.

mukhyam upagalmo for anu hr̥itamukhy apagalbho ; pragalmo for pragalbho ; na dr̥tyanta for 'nādr̥tya tad); GB. ii. 2. 6 with AB. i. 18 (*sambharāṃiti for sambharāmeti ; sambhṛtyocatur for sambhṛtyocur*); GB. ii. 3. 6 (latter half) with AB. vii. 33. 6 (*pratyaviharttum anarihan for pratyavahartum anarhan*); and so in very many more cases.¹ Indeed, the future editor of the GB. will find his task sensibly relieved by following out the correspondences of the GB. with other Brāhmaṇa-texts as stated in the sequel of the present article. In general, the Hindu editors are conscious neither of any connection between the GB. and the remaining Atharvan texts (Sāmhitā, Vāitāna, Kāuṣika, etc.), nor of any dependence of the GB. upon the older Brāhmaṇa-texts. Nor do they treat the text as though it followed any connected plan: in the main each section, or group of sections, is dealt with individually, as though it were a note or excerpt, without any reference to the scheme of the gr̥āuta-sacrifice. The case is by no means quite as bad as that.

¹ The statement of the entire list of corrections which suggest themselves would amount almost to a new edition; we may content ourselves here with a small anthology: p. 23, last line, *krodhopaglāgham* for *krodho 'paḥ glāgham*; p. 24, l. 2 from bottom, *pāpīyāni* for *pāpīyān iva*; p. 25, l. 16, *uptāya* for *utthāya*; p. 27, l. 16, *papātāsmataṃ* for *papātāsmṛtaṃ*; p. 29, l. 6, *asi tanyūr* for *asitajñūr*; p. 29, l. 14, *uccāyataṃ tam* for *uccā patantam*; p. 58, l. 5, *'yeptyañce* for *'yetthaṃ ce*; p. 60, l. 11, *yaṃ vāi loko* for *'yaṃ*, etc. (a common type of error); p. 70, l. 2 from bottom, *'nnañca* for *'nvañca*; p. 80, l. 2 from bottom, *'tā bhr̥gṣ* for *'tābh̥r̥gṣ*; p. 96, l. 2, *ḥṛuṣṭir* for *ḥṛuṣṭir*; p. 174, l. 2, *anitir* for *anvitir*; p. 115, l. 15, *stutoṣe* for *stuteṣe*; p. 116, l. 15, *agnit̄, agnīn* for *agnīd agnīn*; p. 119, l. 15, *pi vā, somam* for *pibā somam*; p. 121, l. 14, *'tr̥ṣyantir* for *'tr̥pyantir*; p. 126, l. 13, *vīryavattayā* for *vīryavattāyā*; p. 141, l. 9, *ayamityam* for *apamityam*; p. 142, l. 5, *yanno* for *'yaṃ no*; p. 146, l. 1, *ety ū ṣu vṛavāṇi tā agnir* for *ehy ū ṣu bravāṇi ta āgnir*; p. 150, l. 1, *nivikṣyasyate* for *nivic chasyate*; p. 150, l. 2, *puroratna* for *puroruṇ na*; p. 152, l. 1, *antaḥsadaḥ, sandhiṣṭhyā* for *āntaḥsadasaṃ dhiṣṭhyāḥ*; p. 154, l. 1, *jajñire. sa saṃskṛtvā* for *yajñaveçasam kṛtvā*; p. 154, l. 2, *viṣṭadvyarchat* for *viṣvaṇ vyārchat*; p. 156, l. 7, *tām tā* for *tāmtā*; p. 158, l. 12, *iṣāṃ ca svadhī* for *iṣaṃ svaç ca dhī*; p. 160, l. 1, *satyo* for *ā satyo*; p. 161, l. 4, *tvaṃ hi* for *nv ahaṃ*; p. 162, l. 1, *māmūṣu* for *imām ū ṣu*; p. 163, l. 9, *kaviṇ ṛechāmi* for *kaviṇr̄ icchāmi*; p. 167, l. 15, *stuno* for *astu no*; p. 169, l. 9, *kalpayati* for *kalpayeti*; p. 170, l. 13, *tanyūṅkha iti* for *tām nyūṅkhayati*; p. 172, ll. 9 and 14, *prajāpatiḥ* for *prajātiḥ*; p. 180, l. 6, *'yajñā* for *jajñā*; p. 181, l. 18, *dadhikrāv̄o* for *dadhikrāv̄o*. In general the mantra-quotations are especially faulty.

The most important single critical point of view in the analysis of the GB. is the distinction between the pūrva-brāhmaṇa in five prapāthakas and the uttara-brāhmaṇa in six prapāthakas. The pūrva is in no mean measure original, especially when it devotes itself to the glorification of the Atharvan and its priests ; it does not present materials in accord and connection with the order of the sacrifice (*yajñakrama*) either in the Vāitāna or in any of the other grāuta-texts. The uttara follows in the main the order of the Vāit. by compiling—with slight Atharvanic adaptations—from a considerable variety of sources a fairly connected Brāhmaṇa to accompany the action of the Vāit. These adaptations are sporadic, hap-hazard, and incomplete both as regards subject-matter and mantras ; the scrappy character of the result is superficially evident. Yet in a general way the uttara in its relation to Vāit. may be compared with the relation of the first nine books of the ÇB. to the original nucleus of the VS. (books i.-xviii.) ; the pūrva being comparable with (as it is to some extent dependent upon) ÇB. x.-xiv.¹ Both halves of the GB., however,—this is the second important point of view,—are very late productions, one cannot say from how recent a century ; both halves were composed after the Vāit., without, or almost without, any independent Atharvanic tradition. Moreover, the uttara-brāhmaṇa makes the impression of a production later than the pūrva-brāhmaṇa. Thus the usual chronological relations in the redaction of Brāhmaṇa, Çrāutasūtra, and Gṛhyasūtra are turned about in the Atharvan : the Kāuṇika (Gṛhyasūtra) was composed before the Vāitāna (Çrāutasūtra),² the Vāitāna before the GB.,—the cone is inverted and balances upon a mere point of genuine Atharvanic tradition, as far as both Çrāutasūtra and Brāhmaṇa are concerned. We may here characterize the relation of the GB. to the remaining Atharvan texts and to the Brāhmaṇa-literature in general, beginning with the uttara-brāhmaṇa, since its character is much less complex than that of the pūrva-brāhmaṇa. This will be followed elsewhere by a somewhat detailed account of the contents of the entire Brāhmaṇa, section by section.

¹ Cf. Weber, *Indische Literaturgeschichte*², pp. 118 and 130 ff.

² See the author's article *On the position of the Vāitāna-Sūtra in the Literature of the Atharva-Veda*, JAOS. xi. pp. 375 ff. ; cf. Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Literatur* (Bühler's *Grundriss*), pp. 35 ff.

1. **The Uttara-Brāhmaṇa.**—For the purpose of defining the history of this production it will be of advantage not to follow the text section by section, but to deal with certain select themes in the order of their clearness and suggestiveness. We may choose first the treatment of the seasonal offerings (*cāturmāsyaṇi*). To this theme are devoted sections ii. 1. 19–26 of the GB. These are purloined with slight modifications from the KB., being the fifth book of that work in toto. The Vāit. treats this subject in 8. 8–9. 27, and there are of course correspondences between it and GB. due to the sameness of the subject. Thus, the opening sūtra of Vāit. (8. 8) is literally identical with the opening of GB. (ii. 1. 19). The GB. does not mention the mantras of the Vāit., except that it works in the two formulas *om svadhā* and *astu svadhā* (Vāit. 9. 11) in ii. 1. 24. We cannot therefore speak even of adaptation to the Vāitāna. The transaction is an act of wholesale borrowing, to use no severer term, with a sporadic recollection of one or another point in the Vāitāna. There can be no question that this part of the GB. was compiled subsequently to both KB. and Vāit. Even more characteristic is the treatment of the *atirātra* (soma-sacrifice), GB. ii. 5. 1–5. This is compiled from two sources, AB. iv. 5 and 6, and KB. xvii. 7–9, baldly put down, one after the other, without any attempt to assimilate the materials. Thus the three *paryayas* (periods) of the *atirātra* are explained twice as typifying the successive expulsion of the Asuras from the three periods of the night, once in the words of AB. iv. 5, the second time in the words of KB. xvii. 8. Very striking, too, is the case of GB. ii. 3. 11, illustrating, in the course of the *agniṣṭoma*, the passage Vāit. 21. 3, 4 : the Brāhmaṇa is copied with slight alterations from KB. xi. 4 and 5 ; the compiler does not even take the trouble to expunge the expression, *iti ha smāha kāuṣṭakiḥ*, which of itself would betray its origin : indeed in general, throughout the text, the Rishis are borrowed by our Atharvavedin along with the productions in which they figure. Again, cases of undisguised pilfering appear in the three *kāmyeṣṭayaḥ*, GB. ii. 1. 13–15, which reproduce almost verbatim MS. ii. 1. 10, and in the treatment of the *anvāhārya*, GB. ii. 1. 6, taken from MS. i. 4. 6 (p. 54, l. 3 ff.). These are only a few of the cases of this kind : the *uttara* exploits especially AB. and KB., but other Brāhmaṇas, ÇB., TS., MS., and even PB., are not exempt from depredation.

The scope and quantity of these processes may next be stated numerically : of the 123 sections of the *uttara-brāhmaṇa* 79 owe

their materials either entirely or largely to older texts, as far as is known to the writer. And there can be no doubt that future search will reveal still further instances of the dependence of GB., since there are at present no regular channels through which an investigation of this kind may be carried on. The correspondences, stated now in the order of the *uttara-brāhmaṇa*, are as follows : ii. 1. 1 : KB. vi. 13;—ii. 1. 3 (latter half) : KB. vi. 14 (beginning) ;—ii. 1. 6 : MS. i. 4. 6 (p. 54, l. 3 ff.);—ii. 1. 9, very similar to TS. ii. 5. 5. 1 ff.;—ii. 1. 10 (beginning) : Kāuṣ. 1. 29, 30 ;—ii. 1. 11 : TS. ii. 5. 5. 2 ff.;—ii. 1. 13–15 : MS. ii. 1. 10;—ii. 1. 18 : MS. iii. 3. 7 (p. 40, l. 2 ff.);—ii. 1. 19–26 : KB. v. (entire);—ii. 2. 2–4 : TS. vi. 2. 2. 1 ff.;—ii. 2. 6 : AB. i. 18;—ii. 2. 13 : TS. iii. 5. 2. 1;—ii. 2. 20–22 : AB. vi. 10 (complete), vi. 11. 6 ff., and vi. 12. 6 ff.;—ii. 3. 1–6 : AB. iii. 5 to 8;—ii. 3. 6 (latter half) : AB. vii. 33. 5 ff.;—ii. 3. 7, 8 : AB. ii. 29, and vi. 14. 5;—ii. 3. 10 : AB. iii. 12;—ii. 3. 11 : KB. xi. 4, 5;—ii. 3. 12 : AB. iii. 14;—ii. 3. 17–19 : MS. iv. 8. 3;—ii. 3. 20, 21 : AB. iii. 23;—ii. 3. 22 : AB. iii. 24;—ii. 4. 5 : AB. vi. 3. 8–11;—ii. 4. 6 : KB. xviii. 7, 8;—ii. 4. 8 : TS. iii. 3. 8. 2 ff.;—ii. 4. 9 : TS. iii. 3. 8. 4 ff.;—ii. 4. 10 : AB. iii. 44;—ii. 4. 19 : AB. iv. 1. 5–8;—ii. 5. 1–3 : AB. iv. 5, 6;—ii. 5. 4–5 : KB. xvii. 7–9;—ii. 5. 6 : ÇB. xii. 8. 3. 1, 2;—ii. 5. 7 : ÇB. xii. 8. 3. 23–28;—ii. 5. 8 : PB. xviii. 7;—ii. 5. 11 : AB. vi. 17. 1, 2 and vi. 5;—ii. 5. 12 : AB. vi. 6;—ii. 5. 13 : AB. vi. 7;—ii. 5. 14 : AB. vi. 8;—ii. 5. 15 : AB. vi. 18. 4 ff., introduced by a sentence from AB. vi. 17. 2, and ending in a passage from AB. vi. 17. 3, 4;—finally of the 16 sections of the sixth *prapāthaka* all except one and a half (ii. 6. 6, and the first half of ii. 6. 7) are entirely or very largely dependent upon the fifth and especially the sixth book of the AB. These 79 sections do not by any means mark the limit of the materials in the GB. that can lay no claim to originality. Thus GB. ii. 1. 16 ; 2. 9 ; and 2. 12 are open to the suspicion that they are nothing but slightly *Brāhmaṇized* extracts from the *Vāit.* itself, respectively, 11. 1 ; 15. 3 ; and 16. 15–17. And there are other verbal correspondences between *Vāit.* and GB. which need not be detailed here, suggesting the superficial creation of *Brāhmaṇa* matter directly out of the *sūtras* of *Vāit.* Again, quite a considerable number of sections dealing with the *gastras* of the three daily *savanas* (ii. 3. 13–15 ; ii. 4. 1–3, and ii. 4. 11–18) seem to be little more than the statements of the RV. *Sūtras* worked over slightly into *Brāhmaṇa*-form ; cf., e. g., GB. ii. 4. 1–3 with ÇÇ. vii. 22–24 ; AÇ.

7. 4. 1 ff. Future investigations on the part of the second editor of the GB. will doubtless narrow down the limits of the original materials of the *uttara-brāhmaṇa* to a mere minimum.

Just as the *uttara-brāhmaṇa* presupposes the older *Brāhmaṇas* of the Vedic literature, so it is no less certainly based upon the existing text of the *Vāitāna*. The general correspondence of the *uttara* with *Vāit.* in the matter of themes, wording, and mantras is by no means to be judged as derivable from an indifferent source of common tradition; it represents rather an act of engrafting the *Brāhmaṇa* expositions and ideas upon such matters in the *Sūtra* as seemed to the compiler to stand in need of theological definition and motivation. One may say, in accordance with the paradoxical inter-relation of these secondary Atharvan texts, that to some extent the *Vāit.* figures, as it were, as the *Samhitā* of the GB. Thus, original mantras of *Vāit.*, or, at any rate, mantras stated in full, are frequently cited in the *uttara-brāhmaṇa* by their *pratīka*. The *Brāhmaṇa* is not consistent in these matters: the long *yajus* *Vāit.* 3. 20 is repeated in full GB. ii. 1. 7, but the *yajur*-formulas *Vāit.* 3. 14; 4. 16, are cited by *pratīka* GB. ii. 1. 3, and 4. Similarly the *gharma-sūkta* from the *Pāippalāda* is given in full *Vāit.* 14. 1, whereas its *pratīka* only appears GB. ii. 1. 6. In GB. ii. 2. 12 and ii. 2. 18 this relation is especially in evidence: GB. cites there the mantras in *Vāit.* 16. 17 and 18. 11 fragmentarily, with explanations in the manner especially in evidence in the treatment of the VS. mantras in the *ÇB.* Very characteristic, too, for the priority of the *Vāit.* is GB. ii. 1. 16, which deals with its theme out of order and connection, whereas in *Vāit.* 11. 1 it very properly introduces the *agniṣṭoma*.

Nevertheless, the *uttara-brāhmaṇa* has certainly some, though probably very few, original sections. Thus the *prāçitra*-legend, GB. ii. 1. 2, though based upon materials from older texts, betrays itself as an Atharvanic fabrication by the introduction of the clap-trap *Rishis*, *Idhma Āṅgīrasa* and *Barhi Āṅgīrasa*, leading up to *Brhaspati Āṅgīrasa*, who, of course, represents the Atharvanic (fourth) Brahman-priest. Section ii. 2. 5 starts with an explanation of the word *makha* in *Nirukta*-manner, leading up to one of those disquisitions on the defects of the sacrifice (common in the *pūrva*) which can be corrected only by the glorified *Bhṛgvaṅgi-rovid*. Cf. also certain touches in ii. 1. 17; 2. 6, 14, 15; 3. 9, etc. Otherwise the originality of the *uttara* consists in a certain free-

dom in transfusing the diction of the Brāhmaṇa-materials which it has adopted; in assimilating some of their statements to Atharvanic conditions; and, above all, in changing in no small measure the mantras contained in those Brāhmaṇas to those in vogue with the Atharvans. Thus in ii. 1. 1, a passage borrowed from KB., the formula *idam aham arvāvasoḥ* is changed to *idam aham arvāgvasoḥ* (Kāuṣ. 3. 7; 137. 39); in the stomabhāga-legend, essentially identical with TS. iii. 5. 2. 1, the GB. ii. 2. 13 omits *tasmād vāsistho brahmā kāryaḥ*, because its ideal of a Brahman-priest (fourth priest) is a Bhṛgvañgirovid; in ii. 3. 10, almost identical with AB. iii. 12, the *āhāva* and *pratigara*-formulas (e. g. *adhvāryo gaṁsāvom*) appear not in their AB. form but as in Vāit. (20. 18). And other adaptations of this sort will be found upon a closer analysis of the text: they accentuate the consciousness of these processes, which are at times quite clever, at others most superficial and bungling.

2. The Pūrva-Brāhmaṇa.—The character of the first part of the GB. is not as easily definable as that of the second. The most conspicuous feature of the first part is that it does not follow at all the order of the Vāit., nor is its object in the main the illustration of the various kinds of *grāuta*-sacrifice. It is, to begin with, also a large borrower, but the source drawn upon is almost exclusively the Çatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (books xi. and xii.). From the beginning of the fourth prapāṭhaka through to i. 5. 22, i. e. all of the fifth prapāṭhaka excepting the last three sections, the text seems to be nothing but a secondary mouthing-over of a considerable part of the twelfth book of ÇB. The subject dealt with by both texts is a mystic, theosophic treatment of the *satra* of the year and other forms of the soma-sacrifice. Though there is some degree of independence on the part of the GB., both in the wording and in an occasional mantra, there can be in this part no question of independent Atharvanic school-tradition; nor can the subject as treated by both texts be referred to a common earlier source. The GB. purloins the materials of the ÇB. quite superficially; occasionally only it infuses into them those special Atharvanic traits which that text affects. The most prominent of these are the praise of the fourth Veda, the mention of Atharvan, Aṅgiras, Bhṛgu, etc.; see, e. g., GB. i. 4. 24; 5. 10, 11, 15, 19. The dependence in general of the Vāit. upon the school of the white YV. ensures a certain correlation of these

materials with the treatment of the *satra* as presented in Vāit. 31-34; but this is no more in the nature of close companionship than is the case in the relation of ÇB. xii. to its Saṁhitā (VS.). Aside from this, as far as has been noted, only the eleventh book of the ÇB. and a section or two of the AB. have been exploited by the author: GB. i. 3. 2 : AB. v. 32. 3 ff.;—i. 3. 3 : AB. v. 32. 5-33. 4;—i. 3. 4 : AB. v. 34. 1 ff.;—i. 3. 6-10 : ÇB. xi. 4. 1;—i. 3. 11, 12 : ÇB. xi. 5. 3. 1-7;—i. 3. 13, 14 : ÇB. xi. 5. 3. 8 ff.;—i. 3. 18 : AB. vii. 1. 1.¹

The last three sections of the fifth prapāṭhaka contain a metrical treatise on the sacrifice, directed largely towards the interests of the Atharvan. The lack of a certain unity of structure in the three sections makes it possible to imagine that they are not from one and the same hand. At any rate they are not far removed from the type of *pariṣiṣṭa*; they do not bear upon the individual acts of the ritual, but seem to be a statement of the position and beliefs of the Atharvans in regard to the general aspects of Vedic lore and sacrifice, with the special purpose of defining and glorifying the AV. This, indeed, is the leading theme of the *pūrva-brāhmaṇa* as a whole; to this it adheres throughout the considerable variety of subjects which are handled in the first three prapāṭhakas, whether they are cosmogonies, speculations in Upaniṣad style, comments on sacrificial details, grammatical disquisitions (i. 1. 24-28), or even statements in the manner of the *carana-vyūha* (i. 1. 29). To carry to the front the AV. and the fourth priest (the so-called Brahman), who must be an Atharvāṅgiroid or Bhṛgvaṅgiroid, and to point to failure and discomfiture in all holy concerns managed without the fourth Veda, is without question the original motive underlying the production of the Atharvan-Brāhmaṇa. Every tetrad is a veritable godsend to the author. Whether it be the four-footed animal (i. 2. 24); four metres (often); the syllable *om* divided artificially into four moras (i. 1. 16); the cosmic tetrads, earth and fire, atmosphere and wind, heaven and sun, moon and water (i. 1. 29 et al.); or psycho-physical tetrads like speech, breath, sight, and mind (i. 2. 11; 3. 14), they are all pressed into service to show the inherent necessity and primordality of the *catur-veda*, as

¹ Note also the passage beginning with *tad yathā lavanena* GB. i. 1. 14, which seems borrowed from Chānd. Up. iv. 17. 7, and GB. i. 5. 11 end=Kāuṣ. 94. 3, 4.

stated most formally i. 1. 16. Occasionally and quite familiarly (i. 2. 21, 24 ; 5. 10 ; cf. also i. 1. 7 and i. 3. 4) the fourfold Veda is expanded into the Atharvanic pentad by dividing the AV. into two, *gānta* = *atharvan*, and *ghora* = *aṅgiras* (see SBE. xlii. pp. xxiii ff.). Very neat manipulations are carried on to this end when passages are borrowed from older texts, as when GB. i. 4. 24 substitutes *catvāro vedāḥ* for *catuspādāḥ paçavaḥ* in ÇB. xii. 2. 2. 20, or when GB. i. 5. 10 assumes the above mentioned Atharvanic five Vedas for three in ÇB. xii. 3. 3. 2. That the GB. clearly associates the AV. and its functionaries with *brāhma* in the sense of universal religion (*sarvavidyā*) and *brahmā* in the sense of universal theologian (*sarvavid*) may be gathered from i. 2. 18 ; 5. 11, 15, 19 : see the systematic exposition of this important theme, SBE. l. c. pp. lii ff.

Though the pūrva-brāhmaṇa, in distinction from the uttara-brāhmaṇa, leaves the impression of a certain elemental, energetic independence in its composition ; though it does not borrow as much and as bare-facedly as the uttara ; though it does not make it its business to follow and illustrate any other Atharvan text ; yet it is without question an exceedingly late production, and also presupposes the Kāuṣ. and Vāit., in addition to the Çāunakiya-saṁhitā in 20 kāṇḍas.¹ Nor are its materials, aside from the obviously borrowed passages, at all from the same hand ; as can be seen by comparing, e. g., the first cosmogony, i. 1. 1-15 with the second, i. 1. 16-30. The section i. 2. 8 mentions the god Çiva and belongs rather to the Purāṇa than the Brāhmaṇa-period. Section i. 1. 28 mentions an evil divinity Doṣapati who figured as a Rishi at the beginning of the *dvāpara*-age, reminding us of Dūṣin, a name of the devil Māra in the Buddha-legends.² Sections i. 1. 25-27 contain grammatical matters of an advanced type, including the kārīkā mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya 1. p. 96

¹ Cf. GB. i. 1. 4, 5, 8, which allude in a cloudy way to the finished diaskeuasis in 20 books (see Kāuṣika, Introduction, pp. xxxix and xl). Note the contrast between *ṛcām maṇḍalaiḥ* (RV.) and *ṛcām kāṇḍaiḥ* (AV.) in i. 2. 9. The fact that in the late *carana-vyūha* passage i. 1. 29 the initial stanza of the AV. is said to be *çam no devīr abhiṣṭaye* does not, in our judgment, militate against the view that the GB. belongs to the school of Çāunaka, rather than to the Pāippalāda. See Kāuṣika, Introduction, pp. xxxvii ff. The GB. is, however, not unacquainted with the Pāippalāda : see below.

² See Windisch, *Buddha und Māra*, p. 151.

(Kielhorn's edition). Section i. 1. 29 is in the nature of a *carana-vyūha*, certainly very late. The proof that the *pūrva* is posterior to *Vāit.*, just as *Vāit.* is later than *Kāuṣ.*, can be rendered in definite technical form. In *Vāit.* 5. 10 two classes of plants, one Atharvanic, the other Aṅgirasic, are mentioned; the latter, unknown to *Kāuṣ.*, is catalogued in full; the former, having been stated *Kāuṣ.* 8. 16, is merely alluded to with the words *cityā-dibhir ātharvanibhiḥ*.¹ The GB., in its turn, having both *Kāuṣ.* and *Vāit.* behind it,² is content to allude to both classes with the vague words *ātharvanibhiḥ cāṅgirasibhiḥ ca* (i. 2. 18): they would be entirely unintelligible but for their reference to the preceding texts. Again, as in the case of the *uttara*, the *pūrva* at times treats the *Vāit.* as its *Samhitā*, as far as the mantras are concerned. Thus GB. i. 1. 12 quotes the *pāda*, *agnir yajñam trivṛtaṁ sapta-tantum* from the Pāipp. hymn given in full *Vāit.* 10. 17; and GB. i. 2. 18 (end) quotes by *pratīka* the five stanzas given in full *Vāit.* 6. 1. Finally, aside from the general correspondence of subject-matter and terminology, as when, e. g., GB. i. 3. 11, 12 shares with *Vāit.* important words unknown elsewhere,³ the GB. occasionally presents Brāhmaṇa-matter which reads like a late note on *Vāit.* Thus, e. g., GB. i. 3. 17, describing the variety of *agnisṭoma* called *ekagu*, is hardly more than an after-thought to *Vāit.* 24. 20; GB. i. 2. 18 (second half) contains an Atharvanic legend clearly built upon *Vāit.* 5. 10, and, more remotely, upon *Kāuṣ.* 8 and 9.

Yet the *pūrva-brāhmaṇa*, though very late, is not devoid of a certain originality. The two cosmogonies, respectively i. 1. 1-15 and i. 1. 16-30; the *gāyatrī*-theology i. 1. 31-38; the sections on the duties of the Brahmacārin, with its rubrication of AV. xi. 5, in i. 2. 1-9; the Brāhmaṇa of the 'fire-footed horse' at the *agnyādhāna* in i. 2. 18-21 (with quite a number of original words at the end of i. 2. 21); the trivial Brāhmaṇa on the *svāhā* in i. 3. 16, and other sections seem to represent a form of scholastic activity unknown elsewhere in this precise form. The list of

¹ See the author, JAOS. xi. p. 387.

² The passage, *eṣa ha vāi vidvān sarvavid brahmā yad bhṛgvāṅgirovid*, etc., GB. i. 5. 11 (end), seems to be copied from *Kāuṣ.* 94. 3, 4.

³ Cf. also GB. i. 3. 19 with *Vāit.* 11. 17 ff.; GB. i. 3. 21 with *Vāit.* 11. 20-26; GB. i. 3. 22 with *Vāit.* 12. 1; GB. i. 3. 23 with *Vāit.* 12. 14; GB. 1. 5. 8 with *Vāit.* 34. 21. For orthographic peculiarities shared alike by *Vāit.* and GB. see Garbe, Introduction to the text-edition of *Vāit.*, p. vi, note.

Vedic subsidiary writings in i. 2. 10, though again late in character, does not occur elsewhere in this arrangement and extent.¹ A somewhat independent statement of the *yaññākrama* is presented in i. 5. 7. No Vedic text is entirely devoid of independent mantras and formulas, or fails to introduce independent variants into such as are paralleled by other texts. In this regard the *pūrva-brāhmaṇa* does not differ essentially from the older *Brāhmaṇas*: i. 1. 9 contains a mantra of Upaniṣad character (*creṣṭho ha vedas*, etc.), repeated with variants by Sāyaṇa in his Introduction to the AV., p. 5, but unknown elsewhere in the literature; in i. 1. 39 the mantra, *āpo garbham janayantīḥ*, seems to be a somewhat independent (Pāippalāda?) version of AV. iv. 2. 8; in i. 2. 7 an expiatory mantra, recited by Brahmacārins in case they happen to step upon a burial-spot, is added to certain other formulas of a similar nature, shared by Vāit. (12. 8, 9) and GB.; at the end of the same section (i. 2. 7) AV. xi. 5. 23 is presented in *sakalapāṭha* with its second hemistich differing markedly from the vulgata form: this, in fact, is the version of the Pāippalāda at the end of the 18th book (see Roth, *Der Atharvaveda in Kaschmir*, p. 23). Similarly the mantra, *catvāri ṣṛṅās trayo*, etc., in i. 2. 16 is quoted from the Pāipp., the blunder *ṣṛṅās* for *ṣṛṅā*, RV. iv. 58. 3, et al., included; see Roth, *ibid*. In i. 2. 9 the mantra, *antarikṣe pathibhir*, etc., shows marked variants as compared with its parallel, RV. x. 168. 3; the formulas in i. 3. 13 do not occur in Vāit., and differ from those in the corresponding passage ÇB. xi. 5. 3. 8 ff.; the two stanzas at the end of i. 5. 5 also present variants as compared with ÇB. xii. 3. 2. 6, 7, occurring nowhere else; above all, the typical mantras at the three daily soma-offerings (*cyeno*, *si*, etc.) in i. 5. 12 differ not only from those of the corresponding passage, ÇB. xii. 3. 4. 3-5, but also from those of the Çāunakīya-saṁhitā (AV. vi. 48), and, as far as is known, from all other versions of these formulas.² And throughout the text, aside from the three metrical chapters i. 5. 23-25, there are *glokas* and other metrical passages so clearly Atharvanic in character that they may not be expected to turn up in older texts (see, e. g., i. 1. 32. end): their *pariṣiṣṭa*-character and their independence are equally obvious.

¹ List of subsidiary Vedic literary types are mentioned also in i. 1. 10, 21, 23, 24, 27 and in i. 3. 3.

² See the writer, JAOS. xvi. pp. 1 ff.